

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of San Diego	Amount Requested	\$1,803,361
------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title	Total Proposal Cost	\$5,757,470
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------

Avenida de la Playa Storm Drain Upgrades and
Dry Weather Diversion

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project is designed to address the persistent problem of flooding along Avenida de la Playa in La Jolla and reduce bacteria loads to the Area of Special Biological Significance as a result of stagnation in the existing storm drain system. The current storm drain system is undersized and is unable to adequately convey stormwater flows from even moderate storms. As a result, flooding occurs and damages local infrastructure, residences and businesses. The Project will address this issue by installing larger storm drains that will reduce the amount of flooding that occurs. This project will install a new outfall that will help rectify these issues and reduce flooding.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	6/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	3/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			32

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed, and is not supported by thorough documentation and sufficient rationale. Conceptual plans, specifications, or other technical information consistent with the design summarized in the Work Plan could have resulted in a higher score for this criterion. A CD with supporting documentation is referenced in the Work Plan, but not provided (nor is the supporting documentation provided in the Bond Management System. An abstract and status of the project (10%-30%) is provided. Regional and Project location maps are provided. The Proposal discusses appropriate submittals to DWR.

Budget

The criterion is less than fully addressed and there is insufficient information on how the project costs are estimated. The Proposal includes detailed cost information, but not all costs are supported by thorough documentation. It is difficult to determine the project alternative selected to verify costs using the limited documentation provided. There are discrepancies between the summary Budgets and the detailed Budgets, particularly between Tables 4-2 and 4-4. For example, the construction costs provided on Table 4-4 equal \$2,425,331, but are listed as \$2,272,733 on the summary table, Table 4-2. The applicant could have referenced an engineer's estimate from their preliminary design report to verify costs. There also appears to be a mathematical error throughout Table 4-4, as the Funding Match column is not in agreement with the rest of the table.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation between six and 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011), based on a construction contract award date estimated to be September 7, 2012. The Schedule is not organized using the same tasks outlined in the Work Plan and Budget. Additionally, the Schedule only showed a 90 day construction window; there is a question if this amount of time is realistic given the activities depicted in the Work Plan.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Proposal did not include a Project Performance Measures Table. The application only addresses project goals and monitoring system. The required Project Performance Measures are not provided, thus limiting the reviewer's ability to evaluate the Project's Goals and Targets. Targets should be quantified, if possible. The project is consistent with Basin Plan.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of FDR and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. In particular, potential flood damages are not well-documented. Structure data are from assessor's improvement values, but what share of value is damaged? Table 11 includes a probability of structural failure without project that is not well-documented. Total Net Present Value (NPV) of costs is \$3.154 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$1.633 million. The estimated annual damage in Table 12 is not calculated correctly from Table 11. The reviewed estimates FDR benefits are at least \$2.5 million NPV. Water supply benefits are not claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Only low levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal, as demonstrated by the analysis and supporting documentation. A quantified benefit of \$702,000 is based on a doubling of visitation at local beaches; no documentation is provided. This increase of visitation is not justified by any text. No discussion is provided in Attachment 9. A short discussion of water quality and other benefits is provided in Attachment 7. The text mentions increased recreational opportunities, especially at La Jolla Shores park, from reduced bacteria, sediment, solids and trash, and benefits to Area of Special Biological Significance 29 and the San Diego La Jolla Underwater Park Ecological Reserve. More discussion of potential water quality benefits of the dry-weather diversion system is in Attachment 3. This project is relatively

small as measured by cost. Still, more detail in Attachment 9 regarding water quality benefits would be justified.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Expand Environmental Stewardship, Practice Integrated Flood Management, and Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.